A Unifying Framework for Measuring Weighted Rich Clubs by Integrating Randomized Controls

Jeff Alstott,[1,2] Pietro Panzarasa,[3] Mikail Rubinov,[4] Ed Bullmore,[4] and Petra Vértes[4]

[1]*Section on Critical Brain Dynamics, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, 20892 Maryland, USA*
[2]*Behavioural and Clinical Neuroscience Institute, Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 0SZ UK*
[3]*School of Business and Management, Queen Mary University of London, London, E1 4NS UK*
[4]*Department of Psychiatry, Behavioural and Clinical Neuroscience Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 0SZ UK*

arXiv:1402.4540v1 [physics.soc-ph] 19 Feb 2014

Network theory helps uncover organizational features of complex systems. In many real-world networks, exclusive groups of highly linked elements form rich clubs, which have key functional roles. Detecting rich clubs when links are weighted is non-trivial however, and multiple metrics have been proposed. We reduce these metrics to a single form by integrating the role of randomized controls. Using this framework we show how topology and weights can play distinct roles in rich-clubs and discuss how several previous reports of weighted rich clubs conflated the two using inappropriate controls.

The mesoscopic organization of a system is often described by partitioning the system into communities of densely connected elements, typically regarded as functional subunits [8, 9]. This perspective is premised on a somewhat egalitarian view of a system's organization that does not differentiate between individual elements' functional importance. Yet, some elements are more influential than others [10, 11]. For instance, to fully understand the coordination of global trade, it is necessary to recognize the crucial role of global cities, prototypically New York, that exercise an enormous influence over the transactions occurring in the global economic system. Uncovering the pattern of interactions between the prominent elements of a system is thus crucial for the study of its mesoscopic organization.

Here we use network theory to describe a system's interacting elements as nodes connected by links [12–14]. Within networks, rich clubs are exclusive groups of preferentially connected prominent nodes [1–3]. Rich clubs can serve as a network's backbone for optimizing the routing between peripheral nodes [4], and can substantially affect a number of the network's properties, including clustering and assortativity [15]. Accordingly, targeted attacks to connections within the rich club may damage a network's connectivity more than attacks to the links of hubs that are not rich-club members [3].

Rich clubs may be topological or weighted. In topological rich clubs the rich nodes preferentially create connections to each other. In weighted rich clubs the rich nodes preferentially invest in those connections, thus giving them more weight (i.e. intensity, capacity, duration, intimacy, or exchange of services [16]). The topological rich-club coefficient ϕ is the ratio between the number of existing connections between the rich nodes, E, and the number of possible connections between them [1, 2]. For a given set of N rich nodes, the coefficient is formalized as:

$$\phi = \frac{2E}{N(N-1)}, \tag{1}$$

where the number of possible undirected connections is $N(N-1)/2$. Richness is defined in terms of any ordinal property of the nodes (the richness parameter r), commonly taken to be the degree of nodes, (i.e., the number of links connected to the nodes). Rich nodes are those whose richness exceeds a given threshold $\overline{r}$. The rich-club coefficient ϕ can thus be calculated in relation to any value of $\overline{r}$.

Despite the straightforward definition of the topological rich-club coefficient, its generalization to weighted rich clubs has not been trivial. Multiple possible metrics extending Eq. 1 to weighted networks have been proposed [2, 5–7]. All these metrics have the form:

$$\phi = \frac{C}{F}, \tag{2}$$

where C is the weighted connectedness of the club (Figure 1), defined as the sum of the weights of the links between the rich nodes, and F is the maximal possible weighted connectedness the rich club could have. How the value of F is calculated depends on domain-specific assumptions about how weights and links could be added or redistributed across the network. Figure 2 contains previously proposed as well as several novel measures of F, organized along two dimensions: i) how many links could contribute to F (rows), and ii) where the weights associated to these links are drawn from (columns).

The use of such a domain-specific denominator F has been a common practice; yet, it is unnecessary, it may involve practical difficulties in its calculation, and it may induce biases in the detection of rich clubs by obscuring the influence of randomized controls. Indeed, the evaluation of the weighted connectedness of a rich club requires



FIG. 1: **Weighted rich clubs are measured in terms of the weighted connectedness between rich nodes.** The rich club (large, red nodes; color online) is the set of nodes with a richness value above a certain threshold $\overline{r}$. In this example, the richness parameter is degree and $\overline{r} = 3$. The rich club is thus the subgraph formed by nodes with degree larger than 3. The weighted connectedness, C, of the rich club is the sum of the weights of the links between the nodes in the subgraph (black lines). The rich-club coefficient ϕ is calculated by dividing the existing weighted connectedness C by the maximal weighted connectedness, F (see Eq. 2, Figure 2).

normalization through comparison to a randomized control, ϕ_{rand}, with the same richness sequence as the real network (i.e., the set $r_1, r_2, r_3, ...$ of richness values for all the nodes). This normalization is required because even networks in which links are randomly established can exhibit a non-zero value of ϕ. The detection of rich clubs in real networks must therefore take into account how much weighted connectedness would be expected simply by chance [2, 5, 17]. Because in the randomized control the richness sequence is preserved, the number of rich nodes N will also remain constant. Thus, for topological rich clubs, we have:

$$\phi_{norm} = \frac{\phi}{\phi_{rand}} = \frac{2E}{N(N-1)} \Big/ \frac{2E_{rand}}{N(N-1)} = \frac{E}{E_{rand}}. \quad (3)$$

For weighted rich clubs, if F is preserved in the randomized control, then ϕ_{norm} simplifies to:

$$\phi_{norm} = \frac{C}{C_{rand}}. \quad (4)$$

Because the randomized control ϕ_{rand} must have the same maximal weighted connectedness as the real network, the two denominators of ϕ and ϕ_{rand} cancel each other out.

The resulting simplified form of the rich-club metric in Eq. 4 has been used previously [18], but here we argue that this metric is in fact necessary. Indeed, appropriate randomized controls should impose the same theoretical constraints on the rewiring of links and weights, and thus have the same maximal weighted connectedness F as the real network. It then follows that any ϕ_{norm} will always yield Eq. 4, as the two values of F cancel each other out.

The framework of Eq. 4 helps focus attention on the importance of selecting the appropriate randomized controls to detect rich clubs. Randomized controls ensure the measured rich clubs are not a trivial consequence of other features already known about the network. In the case of weighted rich clubs, these other features of the network could include topological rich clubs originating from link placement. The traditional use of randomized controls that only preserve the degree sequence (i.e., the set $k_1, k_2, k_3, ...$ of degrees for all the nodes) of the real network conflates the existence of a purely topological rich-club structure (due to link placement) with the existence of a weighted rich-club structure (due to weight allocation) based on a given network topology.

To illustrate the distinction, we examined two networks in which weighted rich-club structures have previously been reported: the global airline traffic network [5, 17] and the structural network of the human brain [4] (Figure 3a). While the two networks clearly exhibit topological rich clubs (3b), it is also apparent that, when the topology is controlled for, weight allocation alone does not have rich clubs (3c). When using randomized controls that alter both topology and weights, however, the two effects are mixed, and thus the two distinct contributions of topology and weights to rich-club structures cannot be disentangled (3d).

Mixed rich clubs may be measured intentionally (as in Figure 3d). However, the previous framework of Eq. 2 made unintentional (and inaccurate) measurements of this mixed quantity more likely through mismatches between F and randomized controls. A number of previous studies have reported weighted rich clubs using the framework of Eq. 2 and calculating the quantity in Figure 2e for F [3–5, 17]. This quantity assumes the number of links in the club is fixed and so was designed to measure solely the behavior of weights, separate from topology. However, to calculate ϕ_{norm}, ϕ was then routinely compared to randomized controls that shuffled link placement and the number of links within the club. This introduced a mismatch between the assumptions underlying the quantity F (that topology is fixed) and those underlying the random controls chosen (which don't fix topology). In addition, by reintroducing the effect of topology via the random control, the value ultimately calculated also inadvertently conflated topology and weight rich club behavior. Such potential mismatches between F and random controls are circumvented by our framework of Eq. 4, which eliminates the need to calculate F



FIG. 2: **Nine ways to measure weighted rich clubs, which all simplify to Eq. 4**. The rich-club coefficient ϕ is calculated by comparing the existing weighted connectedness of the rich club to the maximal possible weighted connectedness, F. Each panel describes an alternate way to define the maximal weighted connectedness, and shows the set of links whose collective weight is F. Underlying each metric are different assumptions about how links and weights could, in principle, be alternatively arranged in the network to yield the maximal possible weighted connectedness. Preserving these assumptions in the creation of randomized controls will ensure that the normalized rich-club coefficient ϕ_{norm} simplifies to Eq. 4. The nine measures in this figure are organized along two dimensions: (i) how many links could contribute to F (rows), and (ii) where the weights associated to these links are drawn from (columns). *Left Column (Capped Weight)* Assumes links could have any weight up to a specific maximal weight. This is relevant in such cases as correlation-based financial networks, where every pair of nodes (e.g. stocks) could in principle have highly correlated activity (strong connection), and the maximal correlation value is 1. *Middle Column (Globally Selected)* Assumes weights are attached to the links, so that the maximal weighted connectivity would be achieved by taking the strongest links from anywhere in the network and placing them inside the rich club. *Right Column (Locally Selected)* Assumes only links connected to rich nodes can be locally rewired to serve intra-club weighted connectivity. *First Row (P Links)* Assumes additional links can be added within the club, up to the topological limit P ($P = 6$ in this example). *Second Row (E Links)* Assumes the number of links in the club is fixed at the existing number, E ($E = 5$ in this example). *Third Row (All Links)* Assumes weights can be redistributed among the links of the network. For example, panel I implies that the total strength of the rich nodes (i.e., the sum of the weights belonging to the links incident upon the rich nodes) is fixed, but rich nodes could redistribute their weights. This would be appropriate for a social network in which individuals (nodes) could choose how to redistribute their time (i.e. the sum of the weights of all their links) across their social relationships (links) with various friends. Members of the rich club could therefore in principle choose to devote all their available time to other members of the club.



FIG. 3: **Topological rich-club effects obscure weighted rich-club measurement if not controlled for.** (a) Visualization of the two weighted networks examined: the global commercial airline network (top, data from [21], link weight: flights per day) and the white matter network of the human brain (bottom, data from [4], link weight: number of fiber tracts). (b-d) The rich-club behavior as measured by applying different metrics to the global airline network (top) and the white matter network of the human brain (bottom). ϕ_{norm} is the normalized rich-club coefficient, based on $1,000$ randomized controls. The shaded areas highlight those values for which ϕ_{norm} is significantly different from 1 ($p < .05$). Rich-club coefficients were calculated for every unique degree or strength value in the network, until a rich subgraph of only six nodes remained. (b) The topological (unweighted) rich-club behavior. Both networks show topological rich clubs, as identified previously in [2] and [4]. Randomized controls with preserved degree sequence but different topologies were created by the Viger-Latapy method [22], as implemented in the igraph toolbox [23]. (c) The weighted rich club, based on randomized controls characterized by the same topology as the real network, but uncorrelated weights. The strength sequence of the real network (i.e., the set $s_1, s_2, s_3, ...$ of the strengths of all the nodes) was preserved while decorrelating weights, using the methods of [19]. (d) The weighted rich club, based on controls that randomize the topology as well as the weights. The degree sequence and the strength sequence of the real network are preserved. Such controls were used to measure the rich-club effect for the networks analyzed in [5, 17] and [4] (see text).

and places the focus on random control selection.

Just as the various metrics in Figure 2 were originally proposed to address conceptually different questions, the present framework enables different features of a network to be evaluated through different randomized controls. Various algorithms have been designed to create these controls. For instance, the strength sequence of a given network can be preserved while uncorrelated values can be assigned to the weights of the links [19]. For networks with many links, it is also possible to preserve the weight sequence (i.e., the set $w_1, w_2, w_3, ...$ of the weights attached to all the links) [20]. For directed networks, the out-strength or in-strength sequence could be preserved by randomizing the weights of each individual node's outgoing or incoming links, respectively [5]. This procedure has the added effect of preserving not only the weight sequence for the entire network, but also the out-weight or in-weight sequence of each individual node (i.e., the set of weights of all links incident upon each node). The choice of the appropriate randomized control requires domain-specific information as to how the weights of a given network could in principle be reallocated to existing or newly established links.

In summary, while a number of metrics have been suggested for uncovering weighted rich-club structures [5–7], the framework described here integrates the role of random controls to simplify these metrics to a single form. This framework also lays bare how to disentangle and measure the distinct contributions of topology and weight assignment to the generation of rich-club structures.

We would like to thank Tore Opsahl and Martijn van den Heuvel for making their data easily accessible. J.A. is supported by the NIH-Oxford-Cambridge Scholarship Program. P.P. is employed by Queen Mary University of London. M.R. is supported by the NARSAD Young Investigator and Isaac Newton Trust grants. E.B. is employed half-time by the University of Cambridge, UK, and half-time by GlaxoSmithKline (GSK). P.V. is supported by the Medical Research Council (grant number MR/K020706/1).

[1] Zhou, S. & Mondragón, R. J. The Rich-Club Phenomenon In The Internet Topology. *IEEE Commun. Lett.* **8**, 180–182 (2004).

[2] Colizza, V., Flammini, A., Serrano, M. A. & Vespignani, A. Detecting rich-club ordering in complex networks. *Nature Phys.* **2**, 110–115 (2006).

[3] van den Heuvel, M. P. & Sporns, O. Rich-club Organization of the Human Connectome. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 15775–86 (2011).

[4] Van Den Heuvel, M. P., Kahn, R. S., Goñi, J. & Sporns, O. High-cost, high-capacity backbone for global brain communication. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, 11372–11377 (2012).

[5] Opsahl, T., Colizza, V., Panzarasa, P. & Ramasco, J. J. Prominence and Control: The Weighted Rich-Club Effect. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008).

[6] Zlatic, V. *et al.* On the rich-club effect in dense and weighted networks. *Eur. Phys. J. B* **67**, 271–275 (2009).

[7] Valverde, S. & Solé, R. Self-organization versus hierarchy in open-source social networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 046118 (2007).

[8] Girvan, M. & Newman, M. E. J. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 7821–6 (2002).

[9] Fortunato, S. Community detection in graphs. *Phys. Rep.* **486**, 75–174 (2010).

[10] Albert, R., Jeong, H. & Barabasi, A. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Nature* **406**, 378–82 (2000).

[11] Guimerà, R. & Nunes Amaral, L. A. Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks. *Nature* **433**, 895–900 (2005).

[12] Albert, R. & Barabási, A.-L. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47–97 (2002).

[13] Newman, M. E. J. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Rev.* **45** (2003).

[14] Pastor-Satorras, R. & Vespignani, A. *Evolution and Structure of the Internet: A Statistical Physics Approach* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004).

[15] Xu, K.-K., Zhang, J. & Small, M. Rich-club connectivity dominates assortativity and transitivity of complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **82** (2010).

[16] Granovetter, M. S. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* **78**, 1360–1380 (1973).

[17] Ramasco, J., Colizza, V. & Panzarasa, P. Using the Weighted Rich-Club Coefficient to Explore Traffic Organization in Mobility Networks. In *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, vol. 4, 680–692 (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2009).

[18] Serrano, M. Rich-club vs rich-multipolarization phenomena in weighted networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **78** (2008).

[19] Serrano, M. A., Boguna, M. & Pastor-Satorras, R. Correlations in weighted networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **74** (2006).

[20] Rubinov, M. & Sporns, O. Weight-conserving characterization of complex functional brain networks. *NeuroImage* **56**, 2068–79 (2011).

[21] Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F. & Skvoretz, J. Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks* **32**, 245–251 (2010).

[22] Viger, F. & Latapy, M. Random generation of large connected simple graphs with prescribed degree distribution. *Computing and Combinatorics* **3595**, 440–449 (2005).

[23] Csardi, G. & Nepusz, T. The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal* **Complex Systems**, 1695 (2006).